

Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable (ACR)

Unapproved Summary Minutes: July 12, 2023

Attendees

Natalie Rutzell, Chair, County 2
Phillip Gussman, City 1
Nakia Savage, City 3
Bobbi Almond, City 5
Sherry Washington, County 4
Mark Loflin, County 6
Sayle Brown, Cornelius
Matt Hamilton, Davidson
Preston Hagman, Huntersville
Walter Ballard, Lincoln
Thelma Wright, Mecklenburg
Dusty Gilvin, Pineville
Jacob Pollack, York
Diane Dasher, York

Gene Reindel, HMMH (Technical Consultant)
Pearlis Johnson, FAA
Shane Jackson, FAA
Robert Dukes, FAA
Adam Scholten, FAA
Krystyna Bednarczyk, FAA
Stuart Hair, CLT (ex-officio)
Kevin Hennessey, CLT
Sarah Easter, CLT
Karina Solis, CLT
Mike Pilarski, CLT
Chris Poore, CLT
Tony Lyman, ATC Manager
Tracy Montross, American Airlines
Ed Gagnon, CSS, Inc. (Facilitator)
Cathy Schroeder, CSS

Summary Minutes

Open the Meeting

- ❖ Meeting started at 6:00 PM
- ❖ Open the Meeting: Rutzell: I call the meeting to order. The ACR Mission Statement is:
 - *To provide the City of Charlotte Aviation Department (Airport) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with broad-based community input into airport-related noise impacts and to find, where possible, practical solutions and recommendations for the FAA to consider when determining aircraft operating procedures at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Are there any elected officials? *Not today.*
- ❖ Gussman: Resolution. As we all know, Dan Gardon has moved on from the airport. Dan stood out among CLT staff. Since we did not have a chance to say goodbye, I thought it would be appropriate to pass a resolution as a show of appreciation.
 - *The Charlotte Airport Community Roundtable would like to recognize and thank Dan J. Gardon, formerly the Noise Abatement Coordinator for CHARLOTTE DOUGLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, for the capable support he has provided us since our inception. Dan was always ready to help educate, navigate and listen to our concerns as we navigated the past years always with a friendly smile and often with more compassion than we expected. We wish you the best in your future endeavors!*
- ❖ Gussman: *Loflin moves, and seconded by Wright and Almond.* The resolution passes. Thank you. We will send it to Dan in a more official format.
- ❖ Rutzell: Member updates. We got some unfortunate news that Darren Crosby has passed away. He represented an area north of the airport. He was passionate about wanting to make the community better. He was a native North Carolinian, and that brought a unique perspective. He will be remembered for his contributions to the ACR. We'd like to request a moment of silence to honor him. *Silence.*
- ❖ Gagnon: Thank you, Natalie. For introductions, first will be our newest member, Dusty Gilvin.

- ❖ Gilvin: I have had a few deployments over 8 years in the Navy. Currently serving as Chief Operating Officer for a software company headquartered in Charlotte. Live in Pineville with wife and son.
- ❖ Gagnon: *Facilitated introductions – ACR, CLT, FAA, AA, HMMH, and CSS.*
 - Meeting logistics. You can participate online by speaking. If you do, please use the “Raise your Hand” icon. Kevin is monitoring that and the chat. We save the chat to incorporate in the Minutes. Please share your name when speaking, and please mute when you are not speaking. We have a very full meeting. *Went over the Agenda and what it entails.* We will spend about the next hour with the FAA Noise Policy Review (NPR) and discussion. There will be some Q&A. There is a draft document that Natalie and Phil would like you all to review in terms of ACR response to that. The second portion of our meeting will look fairly standard. CLT updates, FAA updates, and Project Team updates. Then, we’ll go into additional business points. In terms of other information, if you cannot see the screen, this document was emailed out yesterday. I will reference page numbers at the top of page.
 - Ground Rules: We always try to have healthy, productive, and effective meetings. Healthy - Not make things personal. Productive - We have a very busy Agenda, so we want to stay on task. Effective in making noise improvement in our area.
- ❖ Rutzell: Seek approval of April Minutes: *Dasher moved, Wright seconded.* The Minutes are approved.
- ❖ Wright: I’d like to commend Cathy on the great job she does on the Minutes.
- ❖ Gagnon: No public speakers tonight. Kevin will drop links in the chat – that are also in the calendar invite – for speaking at the meetings or if someone has a complaint.

Address FAA’s Noise Policy Review - FAA Noise Policy Review and Discussion

- ❖ Gagnon: As a refresher for everyone, you have received a few e-mails in the last couple of months specific to the Noise Policy Review that the FAA has undertaken; the quarterly ACR Member Newsletter also included a request on the part of the FAA for input and comment from you on the FAA Noise Policy. There were 4 webinars you were invited to, and links were provided in May.
- ❖ Bednarczyk: Good evening. I will hand off halfway to Adam, who I believe many of you know. Don Scata, the Noise Division Manager, sends his regards – he could not be here today because of another meeting. Thank you to CLT team and FAA members for having us here and making this possible. We are here to talk to you today about the Noise Policy Review, and we will quickly speak through a few slides and give you time for questions.
 - The FAA has long recognized that aircraft noise presents a challenge for communities and as a result, we have focused on developing a Noise Research Program to try to better understand and be able to respond to those community concerns. As part of our research program, we conducted a national study to gather data to better understand community response to aircraft noise.
 - Slide 2: Neighborhood Environmental Survey (NES) results. We want to make sure that we are addressing and meaningfully collaborating with all aviation stakeholders; part of doing so is looking at data received from the survey - included over 10,000 people who are living near 20 representative airports around the country, and gauging annoyance response to aircraft noise. Part of what was done during this study was follow-up interviews of approximately 2000 respondents to obtain additional qualitative information regarding those individuals’ responses to noise. Those responses were used to develop aviation-focused nationally representative Dose response curve, which is a tool that establishes the relationship between annoyance and noise exposure, and what you are seeing here are two side-by-side images – one that shows historic curve, which is generally referred to as the Schultz Curve, and then the National Curve that was derived from the best-in-class research that the FAA conducted. While the survey showed a substantial increase in public annoyance to aircraft noise compared to the data that we and other agencies relied on to inform the noise policy developed in the 1970s, you can see now that people are more highly annoyed at comparable levels of DNL in both curves. Whereas the Schultz Curve showed approximately 10% of respondents identified as highly annoyed in the 1970s, now, based on the research done in this century, the National Curve shows that more than 60% of people identified as highly annoyed at 65 DNL level. The research is consistent with the trend of increased noise concerns as well as recent survey results conducted in the US. That might make you question what the results mean. Public perception on noise has changed. It does not mean that our tools are not working, but it does mean that we need to think about how to update those tools to reflect current perception.

There might be multiple factors that are driving those changes. Part of what we are doing through the Noise Policy Review is seeking public input to inform next steps. Public and stakeholder feedback on these issues is going to be critical to informing our understanding of these survey results.

- Next slide (3): High level summary of the types of comments we received on a 2021 Federal Register Notice that we issued describing our Noise Research Portfolio and announcing the NES results, which is the National Curve results from the previous slide. We were very happy to see that more than 4000 individual respondents provided feedback on that notice. What you see here are some of the themes that we received. What are these tags? Many of the commenters provided us with very detailed feedback covering a multitude of topic areas, and we tried to categorize these comments and think about how we can use those responses to influence the agency's future direction. I will highlight 3 themes:
 - One was to stop doing research. There is very much a perception that our policy is stale as compared to the state of the research. This policy review is a direct outgrowth of that.
 - We also asked for information about noise metrics and noise thresholds. One of the major things that came from comments is we should be looking at alternate metrics or other thresholds in response to the research we conducted, particularly like other metrics that covered the frequency of overflights or the cadence of operations when disclosing noise impacts to communities. We will talk about that in greater depth further on.
 - The final major theme of comments related to our transparency in terms of our process. Stakeholders want to understand what we're doing, on what timeline, and what that involved. Additional information can be accessed via FAA's REDAC site.
- Next slide (4) - What have we been doing since we initiated the NES and research portfolio in 2021? It took us some time to work through the more than 4000 comments that we received. In late 2021, we initiated the Policy Review and spent some time thinking about how to procedurally address this topic, how to engage with stakeholders, and what should be the scope of that engagement. We knew that we needed to take a data-driven approach to this, build on our scientific understanding of noise impacts, use the NES to inform policy development, and also think about what we need to do to develop analytical tools and technology to help us better communicate aircraft noise impacts with the public. This is also a commitment to look at the distribution of environmental risks, tradeoffs, or externalities across communities.
- Goals: (1) Identify and implement well-reasoned, scientifically-grounded noise policy updates that incorporate FAA's updated understanding of aviation noise and human response, and the development of analytical tools and technologies to better manage and reduce the environmental impacts of aviation. (2) Procedurally, conduct an inclusive, transparent, and participatory process that prioritizes input from substantially-affected stakeholders, including local communities and groups like you at the ACR.
- We hope that this is the start of a national dialogue on aircraft noise issues that are equitable, credible, and transparent.
- Next slide (5) What is the scope of the Noise Policy Review? We talk about it as being a focus on the foundational elements of FAA's noise policy, and that is the noise metrics and the noise thresholds that underpin every policy decision that FAA makes with respect to noise. When it comes to metrics, we are taking a hard look at our primary decision-making metric – DNL – and how it is calculated; also looking at other metrics, such as number above and how those might be calculated in different circumstances. Also looking at noise thresholds. That term might be new to some of you. We are using it as a selective term to describe the significance threshold under NEPA as well as the definition of land uses that are deemed “normally compatible” under Part 150 of our regulations. Currently, the threshold is 65 DNL, and we are taking a very hard look at that DNL level and if it should remain at 65 or be lowered. If we were to adopt new metrics, should we establish thresholds that align with those specific metrics? If so, what should the level of significance or level of normally compatible land use be, in context of those specific metrics.
- Next slide (6) The graphic on the left side of the slide is indicative of what we understand the current noise problem – pre-pandemic – to be. This is noise contours at Boston Logan with arrivals depicted in green and departures in red. Each of the blue dots represents a unique complaint address. We are seeing that this is becoming an overflight problem, and it is affecting communities further away from

the airport environment. It also aligns with the findings of the NES. Looking at the graphic on right side of the screen, you are looking at how various types of operations with different decibel levels can result in a DNL 65/dB finding. It is equating the number of operations of different individual noise levels and what that might mean. That is starting to depict in our estimation, accurately, what is happening. We used to be in the commercial jet age in the 1960s, where just a few very loud operations very far apart could trigger 65 DNL, and now we are looking at aircraft that are relatively quiet compared to those historic aircraft, but the # of operations are causing 65 DNL contours, and we are facing additional pressures as new entrants come into the picture.

- ❖ Scholten: It is good to present to the ACR tonight. I joined the FAA a few years ago but am very familiar with the ACR, as I worked with Gene at HMMH on a lot of the modeling in preparing for these ACR meetings.
 - Slide 7: Unpacking the Policy Options that are presented in the Federal Register Notice. We have defined a broad policy option space which is meeting the primary objectives of incorporating that updated understanding of aviation noise and human response in the development of analytical tools and technology to help better manage and reduce the environmental impacts of aviation. Looking at using different metrics – vehicle types, looking at the purpose of the analysis and type of analysis. One of the things we are thinking is transitioning away from this noise policy with single metric in favor of multiple metrics. We are thinking about using different metrics for different vehicle types. Maybe we have DNL metric for aircraft, but use a different metric for helicopters or rockets, for example. Rockets have a very impulsive nature of their noise by rocket launch and reentry. Maybe the DNL metric is not appropriate in that instance. Also considering the purpose of the analysis. Thinking that one metric is better suited for environmental review. Thinking about analysis that is suited to airfield changes, something that is better suited for the Day/Night Average sound level metric or airspace changes that maybe is better suited for number above. I am not saying that these are any definitive decisions that we have made; these are just examples of our thinking of working through these different metrics and the options. We are looking for input from stakeholders. We are looking at 3 different buckets of metrics that we are considering – Cumulative Noise metrics, which take into account the cumulative noise energy over a defined period of time, such as the DNL. But we are also thinking of other metrics such as Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). We are also thinking about equivalent sound level, and we give the example of School/Work Hour Equivalent Sound Level. It is a cumulative noise energy, but it is over a varying time period. These noise levels can speak to different interests. We are also thinking of Operational/Single Event metrics. A few of these metrics I do not think are unfamiliar to the ACR as the ACR used these in Slate of recommendations. NA is number above and is just a number of events over a specific time period. It is a good way to quantify frequency of operations. TA - Time Above, which is similar but is the duration of time above sound level and just Lmax, which is maximum sound level from individual event or multiple events over a defined time period. We are seeking feedback on other metrics. We have not identified all metrics. We are also open to metrics that are not specified here. What metrics might be best, speaking to community experiences?
 - Slide 8 – We are also considering revisiting elements of the Day-Night Average sound level by exploring the methods used for calculating it. One of the things that is a part of DNL is the Averaging component, which takes all the operations over a year and averages it out into an average representative day. For example: looking at a peak operational day, or a peak operational month, seasonal averaging, flow-based averaging. We are considering examining existing noise thresholds and considering whether we are to retain the current ones with no change or setting a threshold for any, some, or all of the noise metrics in the system. Change the metric and level used to define the threshold of significance and reportable impacts. Also, revise the metric and level used to define compatible land use and noise sensitive uses. We are also considering reviewing noise policy every 3 to 5 years to determine whether updates or revisions are necessary to respond to new information.
 - Slide 9 – Key Takeaways re: FAA Policymaking. What the possible outcomes of policy change could be: Could update regulations, orders and guidance. For example, we may revise the threshold of noise sensitive land use under Part 150 or for environmental reviews, and we may provide additional guidance on how to prepare those documents. It could result in different levels of review for different action. It could result in better ways to communicate to the public. It is critical that we are transparent about effects any policy changes could have on existing noise exposure. Changes will not affect current/existing aviation noise exposure. We will still have noise. What it may do is for future environmental reviews, change in policy could result in different outcomes that might reduce impacts depending on what alternatives are available and the action being considered. The action will not change where and when aircraft fly. Finally, it will not require us to redo past reviews/decisions. However, future reviews would take into account the policy changes.

- Slide 10 – Federal Register Notice (FRN) was published on May 1, 2023 with a 90-day comment period; it was supposed to end on July 31; FAA extended the comment period to September 29, 2023. The FRN includes a background on FAA Civil Aircraft Noise Policy and outlines next steps, and there are 11 specific questions that we are asking for feedback on. The framing paper is intended to be read with the FRN that provides additional context and discussion around questions posed in the FRN. It is really designed to better help stakeholders understand the questions and feedback that we are seeking. You can submit comments to Docket FAA-2023-0855 at <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FAA-2023-0855-0001>, or contact FAA with questions.
- Slides 11-12 – Engagement. We have a landing page that has a variety of helpful materials. It has links to FRN, Framing Paper, other resources like education materials, videos, how to make a comment on the FRN as a whole. We have other languages translated available. Links to webinars that we conducted, and PDFs of the transcripts. Also, a link to subscribe to FAA project updates.
- Slide 13 – These are just for your reference. Webinars that we conducted and links to them.
- Slide 14 – Further information – NPR webpage, e-mail, phone number. If you have a comment to submit to the Federal Register, the best method to submit a comment is through the regulations.gov page in the docket. We are here now to answer any questions.
- ❖ Pollack: The question I have is does setting a threshold necessarily require a review on proper tradeoff between noise, efficiency, and safety? How does the FAA consider the tradeoffs?
- ❖ Bednarczyk: Is the question, what criteria or things are we looking at to establish or revise new thresholds?
- ❖ Pollack: How does the FAA use the suggestions? If a suggestion reduces efficiency - thresholds would seem to have a tradeoff. Any time you impose a restriction, how do you look at those tradeoffs?
- ❖ Bednarczyk: We are looking for input from the public on how we should assess those considerations. You have heard our colleagues say that safety is the main concern; it is what guides this agency. We are very interested in hearing from the public about, as long as safety is not compromised, how we should be looking at other potential criteria that could come into play. It is a balancing of factors.
- ❖ Scholten: It is a balance. We are interested in stakeholders and what they think the threshold or metrics should be. There are a multitude of factors that we are going to consider, but we are looking for feedback that our stakeholders value. There are very technical people on the ACR who are educated about noise, but we do not necessarily need just the technical comments. Just basic comments are also valuable. That helps us trace a potential metric or threshold to what people are valuing - those lived experiences.
- ❖ Wright: Will the PowerPoint be made available to us? *Yes*. My second question relates to what is stated on Slide 9 – Policy Changes will not affect current aviation noise exposure, where/when aircraft currently fly, and completed ongoing environmental reviews. That is the process that we are in, and we have made recommendations around current aviation process noise where aircraft are flying, and we have just had an environmental review. Is it going to address concerns that we have been working on for the past 6 years?
- ❖ Bednarczyk: That is a valid concern and one that we have heard from a number of stakeholders. Policy development is difficult. For the most part it is prospective, and that is essentially what we were talking to with those comments. The reality is that the FAA is constantly taking actions that have impacts on communities and that may impact the airspace. The intent of this policy is to make sure that we take the input from you and your peers, and then think about how we can do things better. How we can be consistent across the board, taking into account the technical limitations in any given area, but to provide a better mechanism by which we make these decisions. While we may not revisit past decisions, when there is a future decision facing this agency, that is when that policy will come into play, and the feedback that you provide is valuable in terms of impacting how we think about that decision, but also what this policy will mean in the context of future decisions.
- ❖ Scholten: To add onto that, in a future environment, if the ACR had a new Slate or another set of recommendations, it may be considered under a different set of conditions. The current Slate is underway and has been going through the process for some time. I know that it has been a long process, and I cannot personally speak to that process within the FAA. If ACR comes forward with different Slate or a similar Slate, the FAA may come to a different decision because our criteria and how we are evaluating it at that time will have changed.
- ❖ Rutzell: I think you addressed what my question is about, whether we could resubmit the policies that we had if there are new changes. Similarly, it would be interesting to see – since the airport has just gone through an environmental impact study for their new runway – for the ACR to have a retroactive comparison when the new policy exists to see how the two environmental studies would compare.

- ❖ Gussman: I think what we are talking about here is changing that policy. Most of us came to this room to do a reactive thing - to fix the problems. By fixing the policy, we potentially are helping our voices to be heard down the road. So this is something we need to do also, not instead of...
- ❖ Gagnon: Any other questions? *None*. Thanks, Adam and KB.

Address FAA's Noise Policy Review - ACR's Response to FAA Noise Policy Review

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 6 of handout. This is an initial draft of some work that has been spearheaded by Natalie/Phil/Jacob and includes historical ACR information relating to noise policy-type topics, in other words, metrics.
- ❖ Rutzell: Now that we have extension for the response, we might have time for feedback. I think you were asking the ACR to give feedback in a week or so. So, we can turn it around and incorporate more.
- ❖ Gagnon: To the ACR members, can you give feedback on these initial ideas by next Wednesday, July 19, so, we have a startup for revisions to these documents? Keep in mind that the FAA just noted that they have extended the deadline for feedback on the Noise Policy Review to September 29. FAA is looking for feedback on their noise policy, and the metrics and thresholds are the focus.
 - Pages 6-7 encompass a 2-page document that might be an approach for the FAA to consider in their noise policy. Top of page 6 includes background information on ACR and everything that has been done. There are 4 different sections in this first document, and it is a recommended way that the FAA could look at metrics in the future different than primarily having the 65 DNL. **Section 1 notes different Metrics Considerations.** The information that we are getting ready to look at is information that the ACR has looked at over the past 6 years. This is an aggregation of what has been done/discussed in the past. You all typically like to look at **flight activity by time-of-day**. The impact of flights during the day is different than during the night. Making sure the metrics have some type of adjustment - whether it is day or night - or whether it is looking at different time intervals throughout the day. KB has mentioned Peak vs. Non-Peak hours. So, maybe have a different time evaluation by time-of-day. **Population-based measures.** When Gene and his team did their evaluation of Slate measures, they not only looked at what the N70 metric would be in the region, but they looked at the population that was affected by changes the ACR was considering. The ACR has been interested in looking at metrics with a population measure associated with it. The third is **mix of frequency/noise levels**. Some members of ACR and members of the community are negatively affected because they have so many flights. Maybe the noise of any given flight is not that loud, but there are people who are affected by the sheer number of flights, so making some metric that addresses sheer volume; for others, it is a situation that they are affected by noise level. Maybe they don't get flights 16-18 hours a day, but when they get those one or two hours of flights, they are typically very loud. Finally, **distance from the airport**. The ACR has often talked about the contour and the fact that no one on the ACR lives in the contour; so the ACR would like to see metrics that go out a good 20+ miles radius beyond airport property. So, Section 1 of this document is different metrics considerations – what to measure when considering noise.
 - **Section 2 – Approaches to Sample Metrics and Thresholds. N70** - Most of the evaluation done by Gene's team was based on this, which takes into account both frequency and volume of flights. The second set of bullets is - **Define Multiple Ranges of Noise Effects**. There were 2 members on the ACR in the past, Bob Cameron and Kurt Wiesenberger, who presented different approaches to having multiple levels of noise. Maybe you are one of those people who gets a lot of planes, but they are not that loud, that sheer volume might put you in a certain level of noise which might lead to a certain level of mitigations. Someone else might not get a large number of flights, but when they get them they are extremely loud, and that might determine what level you would go into. Based on what that level is, the mitigations/measures put in place to address it might be different. We will talk about those measures in Section 4. Another item in Section 2 that the ACR looks at is # of **Unique Complainants**, which I think was addressed in one of KB's slides where - if that is something evaluated - that could be an identifier of where flights are changing or moving or where people are most heavily impacted. These are different approaches to metrics and thresholds.
 - **Section 3: Monitoring Methods – Ongoing Virtual Monitoring**, where every year or two the data might be refreshed: what does the current map look like in terms of noise exposure within the CLT region? **Change-based Virtual Monitoring**, so when there is a change occurring or planning to occur, it can be akin to some of the analysis like what Adam talked about and Gene's team has done when there is a change that has happened or is being anticipated happening, then some modeling will be done. **Physical Equipment Monitoring** – that was done as a part of the Part 150 process, so that is something that could monitor the noise levels – and **Ongoing Complaint Review/Reporting**.

- **Section 4:** This talks about 6 different **methods to be taken** based on the level of noise exposure and annoyance in the community. Based on what that level of annoyance is, one or maybe all of these actions could be taken. 1) **Purchase/Insulate Homes, Businesses** – that is already done; 2) **Report to Local Municipalities** – when there is going to be a change in how those noise maps work or look, that might trigger direct communications from FAA to local municipalities to inform them of changes; 3) **Publicize Noise Levels** – if a change is going to occur in a community, literally going to those affected areas and talking to them about the change that will occur; 4) **Update/Amend Part 150 Noise Abatement Policy** – if the land use controls need to be adjusted based on how the noise is going to change; 5) **Identify Improvement Opportunities/Engage Roundtables** - looking for opportunities like this roundtable has done, looking at operational changes when thresholds are exceeded or changes are going to take place that may increase noise; 6) **Address Violations of Noise/Flight Guidelines**.
- This initial 2-page document is based on what the ACR has done in the past, and it basically gives strategies and approaches the FAA can utilize in order to not only measure noise but actually do it in such a way that certain actions are identified based on the noise levels.
- ❖ Wright: I have a comment on Page 6. Since Adam mentioned measurements, maybe adding seasonal analysis even though they said they are looking at that in the first bullet. And then the Mix of Frequency Noise/Level, maybe the school/work hours, maybe those to this document as well.
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes, those are good. Those are the kinds of comments that Natalie, Phil, and Jacob want over the next week. I'm sure there will be other updates prior to September 29. If you see something that is missing or needs to be modified, or if you see something on Page 7 in terms of something that needs to be done if noise levels are going to be exceeded in terms of the actions to take, feel free to add those in as well. Other comments? *None*.
 - Pages 8-9 – The group that has been spearheading this response from the ACR to the NPR (Noise Policy Review) is considering providing some specific sample metrics. What you are seeing on Page 8 is a summary of metrics that you all have looked at in the past. If you remember when Kurt and Bob did their analysis, they came up with 3 different levels of noise. One they called Comfort, one they called Concern, and one they called No Go. The terms were made more general in this document. These measures fall into those 3 categories. These are just examples of what the ACR has done in the past. HMMH did some analysis on Comfort, Concern and No Go. They looked at numbers of residents that were affected by changes in some of the Slate items using that ACR criteria. What you are seeing on Sample Metrics Approach #1 is just an example of how the ACR applied some of those metrics that we talked about on the previous page.
 - Page 9 - Jacob Pollack put this together. This gets at that very first item in Section 1 (Page 6) where we talked about having measures and weighting by time-of-day. There are 3 different sections – 1) talks about what are some of those thresholds during airport operating hours that no residential areas should experience; 2) talks about the non-operating hours; and 3) talks about weighting metrics. This is giving the FAA examples of how flights by time-of-day might be applied more specifically.
- ❖ Pollack: I put this together pretty quickly. Looking for peoples' thoughts on these ideas. We are looking for people to tweak this and offer their views to make it more coherent.
- ❖ Gagnon: We will send out reminders; by July 19, please send some initial feedback and send it to Phil, Natalie and copy me. We will bring Jacob in as he is also spearheading this, to work on the document. Initially, prior to understanding that FAA is extending the deadline, we were planning to potentially have a vote, like we did in April, to authorize the Chair and Vice Chair to make edits and submit this, so it would be submitted before the next ACR meeting on October 11. Any thoughts on that, Natalie and Phil?
- ❖ Gussman: I was going to suggest that we add another couple of weeks' space in there, but I think we still need the Motion because we want to make sure this is in before the deadline. I'm sure that it is helpful to the FAA to have it earlier. I think we can move into next month to really make this document something we can all get behind. With all that said, this doesn't exclude anyone from making their own comments, as well. I don't want anyone to think this is the only way to talk to the FAA.
- ❖ Gagnon: To clarify, are you suggesting staying with July 19 and then come back with additional comments in a couple of weeks?
- ❖ Gussman: I think we keep it the 19th the first time, and let the 3 of us take a crack at turning this into something closer to what everyone was talking about and then come back maybe 2 weeks later to ask for additional responses for a couple of weeks. Then get even closer to consensus.
- ❖ Rutzell: I agree. I want to give a little bit of background. Our initial strategy was to just summarize everything that we have done as an ACR and use that as an example to give as feedback to the FAA. Then with discussions with

Jacob, he said “let’s not limit ourselves to what we have done in the past but also to brainstorm and present some proposals of new metrics.” That is why we have included these metrics that were proposed by Jacob. Give it some thought, and if you think of new or different things, let us know. In regards to the actual feedback and timing, we want to have some initial feedback by July 19. We want to take a vote that we are going to continue to edit this document and get the ACR’s approval to do that so we can submit before September 29.

- ❖ Gussman: Motion on Noise Policy Review.
 - *To authorize the Chair/Vice Chair to:*
 - (A) Refine the ACR’s Noise Policy Review Response Documents as noted on Pages 6-9 of the handout, with modifications described/documented during the July 12 ACR meeting.
 - (B) Submit these and any additional responses/recommendations on behalf of the ACR to the FAA.
- ❖ Wright: Can Vice Chair make the motion? I will make motion on your behalf.
- ❖ Brown: Is this something we should pass by Gene? To get his input?
- ❖ Rutzell: I’m glad you brought that up, Sayle. Yes, we want to have Gene review this, as well.
- ❖ Pollack: I am curious whether it might be helpful if our consultant could take some of these things and say “if we did this, this would be the threshold.” It gives us some idea of the contours and how things might move. If we put something in and the contour goes 200 miles from the airport, we would know if we were doing something that is not practical. Fine tune it to something that is more credible when in front of the FAA.
- ❖ Gagnon: I’m having two debrief calls on Friday, one with Natalie and Phil, and the other with Gene, Stuart, Kevin. I will bring that up in my conversations with Gene, Stuart, and Kevin to see the best way to gain HMMH’s input.
- ❖ Gussman: We have a motion made by Wright and seconded by Loflin. *All in favor.* The motion passes.

Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

- ❖ Pilarski: Quick update. This is bittersweet. L&B has been completing the technical work of evaluating noise abatement alternatives, so there is not a lot to report. The noise modeling is going on, and that will show us what the noise contours look like in the future, how many parcels are affected by each noise abatement alternative. I will also say that in the original scope, we had 20 noise abatement alternatives that would be evaluated - 10 of those would be modeled. The TAC and this group have come forward with a lot of really good alternatives, so now there are 24 alternatives that will be evaluated - 20 of those will be modeled. That does provide a scope change. We are going to take that through the airport’s governance process, expecting approval of that next week. There is also evaluation of land use that has begun. A lot of technical behind-the-scenes work right now.
- ❖ Hennessey: Only thing to add, in addition to the scope change, it is likely with these extra items to study, we will have time slippage. Right now, we are thinking October-ish for the next TAC meeting, so that may change. As we get that information, we will pass it on.
- ❖ Rutzell: I was hoping you could address some of the questions that we have had and share some feedback that you have given us regarding the process of the TAC, specifically we asked a question about how a final Slate will be determined and whether or not there would be a vote. Could there be a scenario where the ACR does not support a proposal, and it still goes forward?
- ❖ Hennessey: We did not have time to get L&B to prepare a formal written statement for this, but we talked through this information, and after I tell you what I have here, if you want additional information, that is not a problem. The question I had was “source of consultant recommendations” – basically where did all these recommendations come from? As consultants, L&B listened to the feedback of the stakeholder groups and created alternatives for evaluation that were shared at the previous TAC meeting. L&B specifically took the ACR Slate recommendations as well as the additional list that came from the ACR and other stakeholders, and that is where we ended up with the 24 alternatives, which need to be studied.
 - Under process and staging, I guess the question was about input, weighing in and voting. There is no formal vote on this. As L&B finishes going through its reviews, we will come back to the TAC and present all the analysis. Everyone will be able to weigh-in. It is a constant weigh-in process. Ultimately the airport is deciding which ones go forward and which ones do not. I think, Natalie, one of the questions you specifically wanted was: If there is an item or two that goes forward that the ACR is not in favor of, would that position of the ACR be attached to it, so that City Council and everyone else would know that ACR is not in favor? So, yes, we have talked about it, and we think that is a fine idea. As we put together our final list of recommendations to take to City Council for approval, anything that the ACR is not in agreement of, we will have that listed out separately to present to the City Council.

- ❖ Rutzell: Can we engage HMMH to do some independent analysis using the criteria that we have set?
- ❖ Hennessey: Yes, there is definitely going to be some analysis by HMMH, but we don't know what that will be yet. Need to wait for pared down list that we think will go forward.
- ❖ Rutzell: We would like to look at these proposals through the criteria that we have looked at historically with the other proposals. It is easier to take the proposal and put it through our criteria to facilitate the discussion here.
- ❖ Hennessey: That makes perfect sense.
- ❖ Reindel: What Kevin said is by regulation. It is the airport sponsor's responsibility to recommend to the FAA what measures they want to proceed with for the Noise Compatibility Program. The airport has to do that.
- ❖ Montross: When will the TAC be convened, when will the public meetings will be held? Can we get an updated timeline from L&B?
- ❖ Pilarski: We can work on that. I think the last I saw was a TAC in November.
- ❖ Montross: So, TAC in November, first recommendations shared with the community in December or January? We are not going back out to the public until the end of the year?
- ❖ Pilarski: Yes, there will be a public hearing as part of this toward the end of the year. I'm not sure exactly what the schedule is as far as that goes, but we have had a little bit of slippage as far as the timetable goes.
- ❖ Montross: Thank you.
- ❖ Pollack: I've been trying to get an understanding of the process and the rules of submitting proposals to the Part 150. I know the public was asked by deadline to come up with proposals, and the ACR submitted some things. When we went through all the proposals, it was clear in many cases who was asking for what. There were a couple that it was unclear where they came from, and I had some concerns about a couple of them related to late night flights and specifying what runway they would go into. It took a while to get any kind of idea where they were coming from, and I had heard they had come from the consultant. I was confused because usually in some kind of regulatory process, you have this concept of standing, and people who are interested parties in the process participate in the process. People that do not have standing do not participate. The consultant - I would not normally think they had standing to put proposals into the process. They might identify things that they think are good ideas, and those who are stakeholders embrace or endorse them and put them in. I'm trying to understand what the right is of the consultant to put in their own proposals without some other party endorsing them or telling them to put those in.
- ❖ Hair: I appreciate the question, Jacob, and where you are coming from in your legal background. The consultant is under the employ of the airport and has been asked to work on our behalf. They are not an outside party that does not have a contractual relationship with us. They are taking a synthesis of ideas that they are hearing, and they are putting them together. The consultant does not come up with recommendations independently. The consultant works for us, and they are synthesizing ideas from TAC meetings or other stakeholder meetings. If someone says 'the consultant came up with it,' it is something that has come out of meetings.
- ❖ Pollack: If I am told that the consultant came up with something, it really means the airport did?
- ❖ Hair: Not necessarily. It is a synthesis of ideas that are coming forward from various stakeholder meetings. They are not coming up with independent recommendations. They are synthesizing information that is coming forward and saying, 'here is a recommendation.'
- ❖ Pollack: Maybe it gets dealt with in the TAC process, but it does concern me a bit that you can have proposals being submitted into the process. I'm leery that once a proposal is put into the process, it's kind of in the wild, and you don't know what comes out of it. I worry about a proposal that goes through the process and is adopted that nobody asked to put in. People could have more noise going over their house as a result of a change from a proposal that the consultant put in.
- ❖ Brown: Anything that is put in has to go through us before we propose it, doesn't it?
- ❖ Gagnon: We are talking about the Part 150 recommendations. Kevin, do you want to clarify who has final say on that, relating that back to what Sayle asked?
- ❖ Hennessey: As part of the Part 150, we are collecting input from various stakeholders. Ultimately, the airport is going to come up with final recommendation that we will submit to the City of Charlotte. Assuming the City of Charlotte approves it, then we will send it to the FAA for final approval. This is not going to come back to the ACR for a vote, and if you all say "no," we'll walk away.
- ❖ Brown: Our recommendations, you do take those under consideration? You don't necessarily accept them, but you take them under consideration?

- ❖ Hennessey: We take them under consideration. That is what L&B is currently doing. If they get thrown out along the way because they don't meet certain criteria, you will know, and you will know the final recommendation items.
- ❖ Brown: We are tasked with putting in a wish list that L&B will ask for your approval?
- ❖ Hennessey: L&B is collecting all of the ideas and then are going to study and analyze them. Ultimately, we are the decision-makers. L&B works for us. You have already put the Slate items in, and then you had the additional wish list put in.

Engage/Improve: Updates from Project Teams

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 10 of the handout. Project Team updates.
- ❖ Gussman: The Community Engagement Project Team offered out some documents at the last meeting. We asked for feedback, and we really didn't get any. Would like to get a vote on these and start using them. I would like to see if we can get a straight up/down vote on these first 3 documents. First is a Media update, that we can send out to any media outlets, and they would be available to all ACR members to push out to newsletters, etc. Second is Communication piece that outlines and positions the ACR as a change agent. I believe this was Ed's idea.
- ❖ Gagnon: I developed the draft. It was in response to a lot of residents feeling that complaints are the way to make change, but the ACR really is the change agent. Complaints help to focus where the issues are, but to make real change in operations, the ACR is the real conduit.
- ❖ Gussman: I think this is a great piece that will help us let people know that to participate in this body is a great way to actually make that change. Third is a piece we can put out on social media with formats that people can share individually. Helping to increase the understanding and awareness of how you start the process. I know the previous document said don't just complain, but we also need people to know that they can participate in the process.
- ❖ Wright: On Page 12, Dan's name will be replaced with Kevin or someone else?
- ❖ Gagnon: Yes, and the next meeting date will be changed as well.
- ❖ Gussman: These documents will be updated as we use them. To formalize these as a way we can communicate with some authority that speaks to the voice of all of us, would anyone like to make a motion to accept that we formalize the use of these 3 documents? *Moved by Loflin and seconded by Washington.* Motion passes. I will formalize these, update them, and send them through Ed. Know that we will be able to use them as all approve of them. Please utilize them. Part of what we want to do is make sure that people know we are here. When we have trouble getting membership, I feel that folks just don't know about us.
- ❖ Wright: Is Nextdoor acceptable to us?
- ❖ Gussman: I am a lead on Nextdoor so yes, I think so. We can say it is from the entire ACR.
- ❖ Wright: Local Operations Improvement Project Team update. We are looking for more participants. We have been focused on adherence at this time and looking at the 2-mile departure restriction in South Flow, measuring the violations. The frequency of aircraft flying with the wind and the frequency of Charlotte changing flow direction during the day, determining runway utilization by day. We are also interested in engaging with regional airports to form relationships, and CLT staff are currently reaching out to contacts at other local airports to help identify other local opportunities.
- ❖ Hagman: Government Engagement Team - I will get with Sayle on this, as well.
- ❖ Gagnon: The main point I will share on the Government Engagement Project Team is that the goal for now is building awareness. On Monday, we emailed out an updated version of the government official letter, which focused on the 4th parallel runway. That has been getting a lot of press lately. If you haven't already shared that with any elected officials, feel free to use as a template to give your local government officials an update on what the ACR is doing. It is very easy to copy/paste that letter into an e-mail to government official to educate them in preparation for Part 150 in particular, being presented to Council sometime next year.
- ❖ Brown: I had a great conversation with Elaine Powell. I told her about Darren's passing and Kurt's move to Wilmington. Whatever help we need, she is always there for us. She is a great asset for the community.
- ❖ Gagnon: Pages 16-18 are the cover emails for the most recent Newsletter. Since we meet quarterly, the Newsletter is sent out between the meetings. Lots of information there, some that does not get covered in these meetings. Make sure that you read them.

CLT Updates on Existing Initiatives and Operations

- ❖ Hair: Fourth parallel runway has had ground-breaking with a nice ceremony about a month ago. If you drive on the south side of the airfield, you can see massive tree clearing and earth movement projects. The earth moving projects on the north side are also for the 4th parallel runway. It is moving forward. You'll start to see more and more contracts going forward to Charlotte City Council. We hope to commission that runway in 4 years. Terminal lobby expansion project is on schedule. Canopy with glass installation should be completed next month, and project should be completed in late 2024. Concourse A Phase 2 expansion, which is the twin of Phase 1, just further north, should be open in Fall 2024. We had a record-setting July 4th for us. We estimated 530,000 people traveled out of CLT June 29–July 5. That is approximately 7% more than the same time last year, 12% higher than 2019, which is our benchmark year pre-pandemic. We set records, and traffic only gets busier. Peak day was Friday, June 30. We are setting all-time traffic records at CLT.
- ❖ Hennessey: Operations per day are up about 76 flights a day. The other item I want to point out is our percentage of flights in north flow is just over 53%, so I am happy with that. We would like that to stay close to 50/50. Average cargo flights per day is just over 13. Early turn violations continue to go down, but hovering at about 25. You can see the number of complaints is way off compared to last year, but the number of distinct households complaining is up. That is interesting. Does anyone have specific questions? *None*.
 - Page 20. Total complaints. We track it by month. I think it is neat information to look at.
- ❖ Brown: Early turn violations - are those directed by the tower or weather-related?
- ❖ Lyman: Yes, all turns are directed by the tower. Some of those are weather-related. We note in our log if it's weather-related.
- ❖ Brown: If they are directed by tower, those are not violations?
- ❖ Hennessey: We mark it as a violation because we don't want them to turn all the aircraft early.
- ❖ Lyman: Correct.
- ❖ Wright: On the unique complaints, were they from a particular side of town? Were you able to determine that?
- ❖ Hennessey: Yes, they are from the typical 3 areas that we have always had complaints. Of course, the biggest is the southwest.
- ❖ Pollack: What is driving the significant change in number of complaints?
- ❖ Rutzell: I joke that I moved, and I stopped complaining, so it's my fault. *Laughter*. We used to make over 300 complaints a day, and we are not doing that anymore. There might be fatigue, at least in my community I know that's happened.
- ❖ Hennessey: I'll look into it as I get some time. One of the things is what we call the "easy button" for filing complaints. Maybe someone stopped their subscription. As you can see, the number of individuals is up.
- ❖ Rutzell: There was an initiative in my community to make volume an issue and make sure that you do it as much as possible. I think it became tiresome. It has been communicated that as long as you make one complaint, it's getting counted. It would be interesting to see who is not complaining anymore, like me.

FAA Update on Implementation Process for Alternative Recommendation #3a

- ❖ Johnson: I would like to commend the ACR on the Noise Policy Review. It is some of the best thought-provoking stuff I have seen in a long time, based on recommendations that are in the process of being considered right now. We have already had 1,500+ submittals, and most people are just saying to move the noise somewhere else. I want to thank the ACR for their work on that. As far as raising the altitude around Charlotte, we are moving forward with that, and we are not going to slow that down. We thought there was a shortcut, but that is not possible. We have 2 meetings coming up. I hope to have more of a timeframe that the setback caused us. I will have that by next meeting.
- ❖ Gagnon: Any questions for Pearlis? *None*. The only question that came out of the April meeting was a clarification. You were looking to publish procedures for late 2024 or early 2025, is that correct?
- ❖ Johnson: That is if we could have done the shortcut. I think it will be pushed back as a result of that. It will take longer – we have to go through the full process, environmental included – but we are moving forward on it.

Update on Formation of a Technical Working Group – Identifying Recommendation #1a Alternatives

- ❖ Gagnon: The other item on the Agenda is the Technical Working Group. At the January meeting, the ACR motioned and approved forming a Technical Working Group to focus initially on Recommendation 1a, where the FAA requested the ACR to see if you could come up with some alternatives to Recommendation 1a, which was some combination of continuous descent or optimal profile descent. That group was considering being formed, but at this point, it has not yet been launched. Natalie and Phil, do you have anything to discuss about the status of that working group that you're seeking?
- ❖ Gussman: No, I think we have the group we've got and are ready to move forward.
- ❖ Rutzell: We have ACR members that have been selected but were looking to engage the FAA, HMMH, and potentially people from the tower, as well. We were wondering if the FAA still would want to participate.
- ❖ Johnson: I think we have some concerns around how many work groups we have already. The fact that we are running out of resources to understand the schedule, because I don't want to put something in place and have to undo it, and then put it back into place with what we're trying to move forward. I hope that we can reconsider if that group is really needed right now. I don't want to delay any other projects we're trying to move forward.
- ❖ Gussman: I might suggest we could still form the group and work on things that we could suggest. Then we could potentially submit those to you in writing. We are looking for some way to have a dialogue out in front, and we recognize the process. Possibly our group just throws out some ideas and starts some level of communication.
- ❖ Johnson: We are happy to take any recommendations from this ACR to consider. We are looking at some cleanup work that is going to be done after this project is done anyway. Charlotte is a priority for us.
- ❖ Gagnon: The ACR members identified for that group are Phil, as Chair/Vice Chair representative, as well as Sayle, Preston – two of the ACR's members who are pilots.

Request/Address Additional Business

- ❖ Gagnon: Page 21. Requests for Action from the April meeting. You requested additional comments from ACR members to put into the document to submit to the Part 150 team. There were 2 different documents, one was your recommendations, and the other was your comments on the recommendations that were being shared by L&B. You all did that work. You also responded to questions that L&B had about some of your recommendations. Then, you utilized ACR Member Newsletter to share communications, such as those documents that Phil went over today.
 - Then the Motion that is similar to the motion you had today, to enable the Chair and Vice Chair to submit updated Part 150 comments to the Part 150 team just as today you all approved a motion to enable the Chair and Vice Chair to submit comments on the Noise Policy Review on behalf of the ACR.
 - Last page – no updates at this time. These are just standing items that have either been addressed in the past, or you wanted to see if there were updates or additional items.
- ❖ Rutzell: Any new business? *None.*

Adjourn

- ❖ Dasher motioned to adjourn. Gussman seconded, all in favor.
- ❖ Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm